



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/934,184	08/21/2001	Andrew Paul Sadler	5181-77301	7668

7590 05/06/2005

B. Noel Kivlin
Conley, Rose, & Tayon, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767

EXAMINER

GREENE, DANIEL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding,

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/934,184

Applicant(s)

SADLER ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel L. Greene

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 4/14/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The Applicant argues that Heikali does not disclose writing into said attribute part ... data indicative of a protocol by which the message was received. The Examiner disagrees because throughout the Heikali references are made to the protocol received and the use thereof. i.e. ... receives and processes information ... and provides it to the user with the proper bandwidth and data protocol. Col. 4, lines 5-10, ... information is contained in the incoming data stream ... to define the type of data being received, ... to route received data to the appropriate one of the FIFO circuits. Col. 6, lines 30-36. Heikali teaches determining the protocol of the message received and using that information to determine what actions to take in the manipulation of the data received.

The Applicant further argues that Heikali merely discloses that the microprocessor determines the data rate shaping necessary for a given cell ... The Examiner submits that a reference is to be considered not only for what it expressly states, but also for what it would reasonably have suggested to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re DeLisle*, 160 USPQ 806 (CCPA 1969). Heikali discloses the use of data indicative of a protocol by which the message was received.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-11, 14-29, 32-42 and 44-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamforth et al U.S. Patent 6,470,394 [Bamforth], Perlman U.S. Patent 5,455,865 [Perlman] and further in view of Hiekali U.S. Patent 5,619,500 [Hiekali]

The recitations: a method, a program element comprising program code for configuring, a computer-readable medium encoded, a computer system for routing, and a computer network comprising, have not been given patentable weight because it has been held that a preamble is denied the effect of a limitation where the claim is drawn to a method, a system, an apparatus, etc. and the portion of the claim following the preamble is a self-contained description of the method or the system, etc., not depending for completeness upon the introductory clause. *Kropa v. Robie*, 88 USPQ 478 (CCPA 1951)

As per claims 1, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 36, 37, 44, and 45:

Bamforth discloses:

converting a message received from a sender into an internal format comprising at least an attribute part and a data part, Fig. 4.

writing into said attributes part data extracted from said received message; Col. 5, lines 50-67.

Bamforth discloses the claimed invention except for routing said converted message in dependence on the data in said attribute part.

Perlman teaches that it is known in the art to provide routing said converted message in dependence on the data in said attribute part. Col. 10, lines 10-67.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the linking boxes of Bamforth, Fig. 3, with the routing said converted message in dependence on the data in said attribute part of Perlman, in order to insure the right recipients receive their intended data.

Bamforth discloses the claimed invention except for the data indicative of a protocol by which the message was received. Hiekali teaches that it is known in the art to provide data indicative of a protocol by which the message was received. Fig. 3, Col. 9, lines 1-30. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the determine type of data in the segment or field, **403**, Fig. 4 with the data indicative of a protocol by which the message was received of Hiekali, in order to maintain a directory of the protocols received by senders to be able to send data back to the original sender in their specific type of format/protocol.

As per claim 36:

Bamforth further discloses:

protocol handler extracts message level protocol data and writes this into the attribute part of the converted message. Col. 5, lines 50-67.

As per claims 2, 20, and 38:

Bamforth further discloses:

comprising identifying the format in which the message was received, and writing data identifying that format into said attribute part. Fig. 4.

As per claims 3, 21, and 39:

Bamforth discloses the claimed invention except for determining where to send the message is dependent on the attributes.

Perlman teaches that it is known in the art to provide determining where to send the message is dependent on the attributes.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the universal data routers of Bamforth, Col. 3, lines 1-20, with where to send the message is in the attributes of Perlman, Fig. 2,

As per claims 4, 22 and 40:

Bamforth discloses the claimed invention except for authenticating the identity of the sender of the message.

Art Unit: 3621

Perlman teaches that it is known in the art to provide authenticating the identity of the sender of the message. Col. 5, lines 50-65.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the Edifact protocol of Bamforth with the authenticating the identity of the sender of the message of Perlman, in order to validate the authenticity of the message.

As per claims 5, 23, and 41:

Bamforth further discloses:

indicating a set of services to which the message is addressed. Col. 6, Lines 30-46.

As per claims 6, 24, and 42:

Bamforth further discloses:

comprising determining whether the sender is authorized to access at least one service; Col. 6, lines 30-50.

in dependence on the result of said authorization determination, sending the converted message to the identified service. Col. 6, lines 30-50.

As per claim 7:

Bamforth further discloses:

in which said identified service updates the data held in the attribute part of the message. Col. 6, lines 15-50.

As per claims 8 and 25:

Bamforth discloses rules for load balancing and setting codes in the header to facilitate the routing of the message. Bamforth does not specifically teach storing a plurality of routing rules and determining whether the sender is authorized to access at least one service comprises comparing said plurality of routing rules with the attributes of a converted message. However, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the arts to know how to modify the known prior art by incorporating the teachings of Perlman that uses encryption techniques for authorizing actions. Col. 3-4, lines 1-67.

As per claims 9 and 26:

Bamforth teaches about the concept of the Edifact protocol converting messages and developing a header for the routing of the message. Bamforth further discloses the concept of comparing the data in the different fields to determine the next action. It is well known in the art that a person skilled in the art knows verification of a digital signature. Perlman provides an example of verifying a digital signature. Col. 3-4.

As per claim 10:

Bamforth further discloses:

writing into said attribute part data identifying the received digital signature. Col 5, lines 50-67.

As per claim 11:

Bamforth further discloses:

comprising storing a plurality of routing rules;

comparing the attributes of a converted message with the routing rules; and

routing said converted message in dependence on said comparison. Col. 5-6.

As per claims 27, 33 and 34:

Bamforth and Hiekali further discloses:

a plurality of applications for converting said received message, said parser selecting at least one of said applications in dependence on the data extracted from said received message. Bamforth Col. 6, lines 15-67, Hiekali Fig. 3, Col. 9, lines 1-30.

As per claims 28 and 35:

Bamforth further discloses:

wherein said data extracted from said received message includes a message type, said parser selecting at least one of said applications in dependence on the type of a message. Col. 6, lines 15-67.

As per claim 29:

Bamforth and Hiekali further discloses:

wherein said data extracted from said received message includes protocol data, and said parser selects at least one of said applications in dependence on the protocol under which the message was received. Bamforth Col. 6, lines 15-67, Hiekali Fig. 3, Col. 9, lines 1-30.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. Claims 12, 13, 14, 30-32 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bamforth, Perlman and Hiekali as applied to claims 1-11, 14-29, 32-42 and 44-45 above, and further in view of Ginter et al. U.S. Patent 6,658,568.

4. As per claims 12, 30 and 43:

Bamforth, Perlman and Hiekali disclose the claimed invention except for determining whether there exists a transaction identifier associated with the received message, the message corresponding to a transaction, and generating a transaction identifier for the message in response to determining no transaction identifier associated with the message exists. Ginter teaches that it is known in the art to provide determining whether there exists a transaction identifier associated with the received message, the message corresponding to a transaction, and generating a transaction identifier for the

Art Unit: 3621

message in response to determining no transaction identifier associated with the message exists. Col. 94, lines 19-67, Col. 31, lines 55-67, Col. 32, lines 1-60.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the determination of the content of a message Bamforth and Perlman with the determining whether there exists a transaction identifier associated with the received message, the message corresponding to a transaction, and generating a transaction identifier for the message in response to determining no transaction identifier associated with the message exists of Ginter, in order to provide the correct identity of what message is to be associated with what transaction..

As per claims 13 and 31:

Bamforth, Perlman and Hiekali disclose the claimed invention except for utilizing a transaction identifier associated with the message to determine whether there exists a previously stored content, which indicates a state of the transaction, and, creating a context associated with the message in response to determining no content exists for the message. Ginter teaches that it is known in the art to provide allocating a new transaction identifier if no transaction identifier is detected in the received message. Col. 95, lines 1-67, Col. 31, lines 55-67, Col. 32, lines 1-60.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the default function of Bamforth, Perlman and Hiekali with the utilizing a transaction identifier associated with the message to determine

Art Unit: 3621

whether there exists a previously stored content, which indicates a state of the transaction, and, creating a context associated with the message in response to determining no content exists for the message of Ginter, in order to provide assistance in the processing of a message.

As per claims 14 and 32:

Bamforth, Perlman and Hiekali disclose the claimed invention except for wherein the transaction comprises a series of messages, and wherein the method further comprises updating a context associated with the transaction as the series of messages are processed. Ginter teaches that it is known in the art to wherein the transaction comprises a series of messages, and wherein the method further comprises updating a context associated with the transaction as the series of messages are processed. Col. 95, lines 1-67, Col. 31, lines 55-67, Col. 32, lines 1-60.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the default function of Bamforth, Perlman and Hiekali with the wherein the transaction comprises a series of messages, and wherein the method further comprises updating a context associated with the transaction as the series of messages are processed of Ginter, in order to provide assistance in the processing of a message.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Conclusion


5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel L. Greene whose telephone number is 571-272-6707. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur. 8am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 571-272-6712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Daniel L. Greene
Examiner
Art Unit 3621

5/3/2005